

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please amend the drawings as indicated by the replacement sheet submitted herewith. In particular, Figure 11 is amended to remove the indication of element 1100.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 13-15, 17, 19-21, 24-27, and 34-39 are now pending. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Vaughn for taking the time to conduct an in-person interview with the undersigned on July 24, 2006. During the interview, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 was discussed. Applicants' representative proposed claim amendments that are believed to overcome this rejection. Also, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Hawkins were discussed. Applicant's representative proposed amendments to claims 14 and 27 that the Examiner indicated appear to overcome the rejections as to these claims. However, the Examiner indicated that he would need to reconsider Hawkins in more detail.

Applicants now present amendments to the claims that include the amendments discussed during the interview.

Drawings

The Office Action objects to the drawings as including reference signs not mentioned in the description. The specification has been amended to refer to these reference signs, with the exception of element 1100 in Figure 11. In that case, Figure 11 is amended to remove the reference to element 1100. It is submitted that the objection is overcome. No new matter is added.

Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification as not including a brief description for Fig. 8, and for various informalities. The specification is amended and it is submitted that the objection is overcome. No new matter is added.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1, 2, 4, 13-15, 17, 18, 21-28, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office Action pointed out that these claims describe manipulate non-functional descriptive material but do not describe a significant

functionality for the processed shorthand. In contrast, the Office Action indicates that claim 7 includes a displaying step, which provides significant functionality and is statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101. (Office Action, p. 5).

Based on this latter statement in the Office Action, Applicants have amended the rejected claims to include a displaying step. It is therefore believed that the Examiner will consider the amended claims to be directed to statutory subject matter on a similar basis as claim 7.

In addition, the various recitations of receiving user input provide additional significant functionality. For instance, amended independent claim 1 recites receiving user input identifying a symbol, a text expansion, and a program; independent claim 14 recites receiving handwritten user input including at least first handwritten user input; and independent claim 27 recites receiving first handwritten user input.

For these reasons, it is submitted that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection is overcome.

Art-Based Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 13-15, 17-20, 22-28, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,493,464 to Hawkins, et al. ("Hawkins"). Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in view of the amendments and remarks herein.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites receiving user input identifying a symbol, a text expansion, and a program; associating the text expansion and the program with the symbol; receiving handwritten user input; determining whether the handwritten user input represents the symbol; determining a context in which the handwritten user input is written; choosing between either the text expansion or the program depending upon the determined context; and either displaying the text expansion or launching the program depending upon the outcome of the choosing step. The amendment to claim 1 is supported in Applicants' specification at, e.g., paragraph 52.

Hawkins discloses associating symbols, text, or program functions with a stroke. (Hawkins, col. 12, lines 6-13 and 58-64). However, as discussed during the interview, Hawkins fails to teach or suggest associating *both* a text expansion *and* a program with the same symbol,

as recited in claim 1. Nor does Hawkins teach or suggest choosing between either the text expansion or the program depending upon a context, and either displaying the text expansion or launching the program depending upon the outcome of the choosing step, as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, it is submitted that the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection over Hawkins is overcome.

Independent claims 14 and 27 as amended are also submitted as overcoming the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection over Hawkins for at least similar reasons as claim 1.

The dependent claims are also allowable over Hawkins by virtue of depending from one of the above independent claims, and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

For instance, new claim 38 depends from claim 27 and further recites that the context includes a number of words in the handwritten user input. Thus, claims 27 and 38 together require that, where a symbol in the handwritten user input represents both expanded text and a program, either the expanded text is displayed or the program is launched, depending upon the number of words in the handwritten user input. Similarly, new claim 39 also depends from claim 27 and further recites displaying the expanded text if the number of words in the handwritten user input is greater than one, and launching the program if the number of words in the handwritten user input is equal to one. None of these features are found in Hawkins.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: July 28, 2006

By: /Jordan N. Bodner/

Jordan N. Bodner

Registration No. 42,338

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001